

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.               | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/041,873                    | 01/07/2002  | Darryl D. Amick      | MOF 304                 | 4960             |
| 75                            | 05/02/2005  |                      | EXAM                    | INER             |
| Kolisch, Hartwell, Dickinson, |             |                      | JENKINS, DANIEL J       |                  |
| McCormack &                   | Heuser, PC  |                      |                         |                  |
| Suite 200                     |             |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| 520 S.W. Yamhill Street       |             |                      | 1742                    |                  |
| Portland, OR 97204            |             |                      | DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |  |  |  | N |
|---|--|--|--|---|
|   | •  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |   |
| Office Action Comments                        |  | 10/041,873   | AMICK, DARRYL D.   |   |
|   | Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |   |
|   |  | Daniel J. Jenkins  | 1742   |   |
| Period fo                                     | The MAILING DATE of this communication a<br>or Reply   | appears on the cover sheet with the c  | correspondence address   |   |
| THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REIMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION INSIGNS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the material part of the part of the material part of the | N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tireply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tute, cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133). |   |
| Status  |  |  |  |   |
| 1)  | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24   | January 2005.  |  |   |
| 2a)⊠  | This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ T  | his action is non-final.   |  |   |
| 3)□   | Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under  |  |  |   |
| Dispositi                                     | ion of Claims  |  |  |   |
| 5)□<br>6)⊠<br>7)□                             | Claim(s) <u>1-17,20-22,27-31,34-58 and 63-76</u> 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-17,20-22,27-31,34-58 and 63-76</u> Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and   | rawn from consideration. is/are rejected.  |  |   |
| Applicati                                     | ion Papers   |  |  |   |
|   | The specification is objected to by the Exam   | iner.  |  |   |
| •   | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a   |  | Examiner.  |   |
| ,—  | Applicant may not request that any objection to t  | •  |  |   |
|   | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr  | ection is required if the drawing(s) is ob   | jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  |   |
| 11)   | The oath or declaration is objected to by the  | Examiner. Note the attached Office   | Action or form PTO-152.  |   |
| Priority ι                                    | under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |  |  |   |
| a)l   | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreignal All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a least  | ents have been received. ents have been received in Applicationity documents have been received and (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  | ion No ed in this National Stage   |   |
| Attachmen                                     | t(s)   |  |  |   |
| 2)  Notic 3) Inform                           | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date   | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da  5) Notice of Informal F  6) Other:   | (PTO-413) ate Patent Application (PTO-152)   |   |

Application/Control Number: 10/041,873

**Art Unit: 1742** 

- 1. The Examiner has carefully considered Applicant's Response of 1/24/05. At this time, the Examiner makes a new rejection which is accordingly not made final. The Examiner notes that he had incorrectly determined the priority date as the filing date without acknowledgement of priority, and withdraws the double patenting rejections since the pending application has the earliest priority.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Page 2

4. Claims 1-17, 20-22, 27-31, 34-58 and 63-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mravic et al. '187 in view of West et al. and further in view of WO'878.

Mravic et al. '187 discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Mravic et al. '187 discloses a frangible projectile comprising:

a W or ferrotungsten component; and

a polymer binder.

Mravic et al. '187 discloses wherein the polymer binder is selected from a group of thermosetting resin (col. 5, lines 47-49).

Mravic et al. '187 discloses in Examples (CODE) 1 and 2, wherein the polymer binder is in amounts of 2.5% and 1.6%, respectively. The Examiner notes that the desired density of the formed projectile would direct one of ordinary skill to small amounts of polymer binder in the projectile.

Mravic et al. further disloses that additional metal powders of iron or zinc as filler (col. 2, lines 30-32), and provides an example of adding 0, 15 and 30% by weight filler material. So, Mravic et al. '187 differs from the instant invention by the addition of less than 30% of a metal component containing tin up to 50%.

Mravic et al. '187 lists tin, zinc, iron and copper as matrix metals, but does not suggest adding these materials to the polymer matrix embodiment (see col. 2, lines 18-29).

Mravic et al. further discloses wherein a consideration in selecting and forming the materials of the projectiles is the ability to adjust the projectile to selected density parameters.

The Examiner notes that the plastic matrix embodiments of Mravic et al. '187 range from 75-84% density of lead (col. 5, lines 62-66).

West et al. teaches that in addition to tungsten, bronze can be used in addition to tungsten, bronze containing 1 to 10 % Sn (see CDC), in the same field of polymer containing projectiles, in order to engineer the projectile to desired density and frangibility.

It would have been obvious to use a mixture of W and bronze, as taught by West et al., in the invention of Mravic et al. in order to adjust density and frangibility properties. WO'878 teaches that tin can be used with W in the same field of endeavor as a secondary metal for the purpose of adjusting density and frangibility, thus teaching Sn as an equivalent to the bronze of West et al., allowing one or ordinary skill to substitute tin for bronze in the invention of Mravic et al. '187 in view of West.

Furthermore, Mravic et al. '187 teaches that metal powder loading can be adjusted to approximate the density of lead i.e. ballistics, see col. 3, lines 22-25. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would adjust the amount of metals loading in the projectile in order to adjust the density of the projectile to approximate lead (11.4 g/cc), thus rendering the claims to higher density projectile obvious by closely approximating the claimed range.

West et al. disclose wherein a projectile is part of a ammunition comprising known cartridge components comprising firing pin, case, primer, and propellant (col. 3, lines 24-33) in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of using nonlead projectiles in range ammunition, with one of ordinary skill in the art knowing that ammunition means

Application/Control Number: 10/041,873

Art Unit: 1742

cartridges of shotgun and rifle, the projectile being formed into the appropriate shape for

Page 5

each application, including jacketing as discussed by West et al.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use the components of West et al. with the projectile of Mrayic '187 in order

to form nonlead range ammunition.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Jenkins whose telephone number is 571-272-

1242. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH6:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1242. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dánjel J. Jenkins Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1742

di